

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
EDMUND OROK EDEM,

Plaintiff,

- against -

ETHIOPIAN AIRLINES ENTERPRISE,  
ETHIOPIAN INSURANCE CORPORATION,  
ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT (FEDERAL  
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA),  
JOHN AND JANE DOES.

Defendants.

-----X

**MEMORANDUM & ORDER**

08 CV 2597 (RJD)(LB)

DEARIE, Chief Judge.

The Court dismissed all but one of plaintiff Edmund Edem's thirteen claims in its Memorandum & Order dated September 30, 2009. Mr. Edem contends that two statements in the Court's Order are "derogatory, untruthful" and impugn his integrity and he demands that the Court retract or amend the statements within seven days of the date of his "Demand for Retraction." He also threatens to "take up the matter with the Judicial Disciplinary body" if the Court refuses to do so.

The Court will not accede to Mr. Edem's threats. Even if the Court were to credit Mr. Edem's facially suspect and hyperbolic assertion that he felt "untold embarrassment and humiliation" as a result of the Court's use of the phrase "American currency" instead of his preferred phrase "my money," the Court would not recognize that kind of unreasonable reaction to judicial word choice as grounds for retraction. Similarly, even if the Court were to credit Mr. Edem's assertion that the Court's use of the term "release" is so "derogatory" as to "highly embarrass" him, the Court finds no justification for retraction. Nor does the Court see how the

phrase “American currency” would make Mr. Edem appear to be “garrulous” to any reasonable observer.

The Court takes this opportunity to note its displeasure with not only the threatening tone in Mr. Edem’s recent demand but also Mr. Edem’s conduct in general. As noted in its September 30 Order, Mr. Edem is no stranger to the Court, having filed several pro se complaints in the past few years. During the course of these litigations, Mr. Edem has consistently engaged in accusatory and disrespectful behavior toward the Court, opposing counsel and the judicial process. Indeed, Mr. Edem’s current “demand” is the most recent in a long list of filings with the Court alleging that opposing counsel or court personnel have lied and conspired to harm him. For example, Mr. Edem has, among other things:

accused the “judiciary of the United States” of perpetrating a fraud against him in “their attempt to continue the extortion and deprivation” of his property without due process (Edem v. Spitzer et al, No. 05-3504, Document No. 8);

forced a district judge of this Court to recuse himself after the judge believed that he could no longer preside impartially over Mr. Edem’s case because of Mr. Edem’s improper comments (Edem v. The State of New York, No. 03-1220, Document No. 46);

accused a magistrate judge of this Court of a “hatchet job” and purposely trying to “railroad” his case (Edem v. Northfield Savings Bank et al, No. 04-657, Document No. 51);

moved for sanctions against opposing counsel claiming they fraudulently misled the court (Edem v. World Airways et al, No. 04-0605, Document No. 12), and committed perjury (Document No. 60 in the present case); and

alleged that a state court judge and state court clerk conspired to falsify court documents and obstruct justice including issuing a falsified filiation order (Edem v. The State of New York, No. 03-1220, Document No. 57).

Despite Mr. Edem’s regular filing of documents based on frivolous and disparaging allegations, the Court has been patient, particularly given Mr. Edem’s status as a pro se plaintiff.

However, the Court's patience with Mr. Edem, pro se plaintiff or not, is all but gone. Mr. Edem's latest filing convinces the Court that he will continue to make unfounded and threatening allegations that waste the Court's time and that often force opposing counsel and parties to bear additional, unnecessary costs. Mr. Edem can have his day in court but this Court will no longer tolerate his filing of documents containing malicious and completely unfounded allegations all stemming from his seemingly unwavering belief that the rest of the world is out to harm him and will lie to do so. Accordingly, Mr. Edem is hereby put on notice that if he continues to file documents accusing court personnel and opposing counsel of committing perjury and being deceitful in order to harm him, the Court may require him to show cause as to why he should not be enjoined from filing any documents with the Court without first seeking and being granted permission to do so. See 28 U.S.C. § 1651; Moates v. Barkley, 147 F.3d 207, 208 (2d Cir. 1998); In re Martin-Trigona, 9 F.3d 226, 227-29 (2d Cir. 1993).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
November 11, 2009

s/ Judge Raymond J. Dearie

  
RAYMOND J. DEARIE  
United States District Judge